

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Civil Works Specifications Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

1. The Civil Works Specifications Steering Committee (CWSSC) met on 17 June 1997 in Arlington, Texas.
2. Announcements. Freddie Rush opened the meeting with the introduction of Bill Miller, CELRD-OR-ET-EQ, who was present in proxy for Mr. Larry Seals. Mr. Charles Baldi could not attend due to insufficient travel funds. Donald N. Johnson was also absent. Enclosure 1 is the list of attendees.
3. Mr. Rush reviewed the agenda (enclosure 2). Mr. Tom Shaw asked to include discussion on CEGS 01000, General Notes. Mr. Tim Pope also wanted to discuss Regional Guide Specifications.
4. HQUSACE Comments. Freddie Rush has received information from Charles Baldi that all funding for the CWSSC has been obligated for this FY and no more funding will be available until October 1997.
5. Review and Approve Minutes of Fourth Committee Meeting. John Kerkowski moved to approve the minutes of the 4-6 March 1997 meeting. Tom Shaw seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous vote. Copies of the CWSSC minutes will be forwarded to EG&G with enclosures.
6. Status of ER 1110-1-1250. HQ IM has changed the publication number to ER 1110-1-1201 and is currently holding the document for their review. Hopefully, it will be issued before our next meeting.
7. SPECSINTACT Interagency Configuration Control and Coordinating Board (SI-CCCB) Meeting. Mr. Tom Shaw presented information on the April 1997 SI-CCCB Meeting. The SPECSINTACT MINUTES are also available on the Internet at <http://www-de.ksc.nasa.gov/specsintact/sib0497/sib0497m.htm>. Items of interest to CWSSC follow:
 - a. The overall volume of calls to the SPECSINTACT help desk has dropped, particularly about GPFs and lack of speed in the SISGML Editor. The largest volume of calls was generated concerning the Submittal Register.
 - b. NAVFAC Electronic Bid Sets (EBS) pilot projects in 1996 revealed no significant problems and saved printing 1.6 million pages of documents. Based upon these results, NAVFAC has set the goal of standardizing on EBS by the year 2000.
 - c. Procurement Desktop - Defense (PD2) was presented by Gail Guseman, American Management Systems and discussed. The product was selected by DOD as part of an initiative to support a Standard Procurement System. However, we don't know how it ties into SAACONS or does amendments. Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML) files can be imported, but the large number of section files produced for each job was objectionable. EG&G will investigate an option to create one large file from multiple sections for each job. EG&G will also check MS Word ability to merge multiple documents.
 - d. EG&G will investigate the applicability of supporting Adobe's Portable Data Format (PDF), HyperText Markup Language (HTML) and MS Word in SPECSINTACT besides SGML.
 - e. National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS) will acquire and distribute all Corps guide specifications from the Corps TECHINFO web page. Tom noted some specifications having spaces within tags and other problems that may be attributed to the transfer method.

f. The Army and NASA will soon adopt the new MasterFormat numbering system. Section 01090 "Sources of Reference Publications" will change to 01420 "References" to coincide with Navy and the current software.

g. All CCB data can fit on one Digital Versatile Disc (DVD) format. They will produce the first CCB on DVD for the fourth Quarter 1997 CCB. Production in dual formats, CD and DVD, will continue for about two years or until all users have purchased the new DVD hardware. DVD will read CD.

h. Dispositions of change requests are also available on the Internet at <http://www-de.ksc.nasa.gov/specsintact/sib0497/1620s0497.htm> for review. Items of interest to CWSSC follow:

i. Request for an option to combine the table of contents with the section file was accepted.

ii. Request to automate the amendment process in the Jobs Menu was rejected. The SI-CCCB thought this request would be more appropriate for a Procurement Management System such as PD2. Part of the problem is the inconsistencies in every service and agency amendment process. Tom will get more information on PD2 from Gail Guseman.

iii. Request to divide the Reference Verification Report into two reports was rejected. The SI-CCCB does not think it would benefit enough users to provide this change.

iv. Request to provide a Quality Assurance menu to correct any tagging validation problems in master text (Tagging errors affect WordSpec). The SI-CCCB rejected this request and said to use the SGML editor to correct tagging validation problems.

i. Develop key numbering system to link DrawSpec components with SPECS-INTACT. SI-CCCB agreed that the key number extension should be adequate to facilitate an eventual link between DrawSpec and existing job costing software. Greg Covington, Tri-Service CADD/GIS, will coordinate a meeting with NAVFAC, COE, and NASA to determine if the cost listing can be used as the key number.

j. Last issue of the Army DOS database will be October 1997.

k. Tom Shaw, CEMVK, will produce at least one job in WordSpec and report any issues to EG&G. The "Beta" designator will be dropped from WordSpec if there are none.

l. The conversion of SPECSINTACT to a 32 bit application was established as goal, but the timetable for this was left to future discussion.

m. SI-CCCB retracted requirement for PerfectSpec because it does not think enough users would benefit to justify the development costs.

n. Priorities are as follows:

- (1) Complete Tailoring Options
- (2) PDF format conversion tasks including 1620 971-010.
- (3) DrawSpec development.
- (4) Implement a new table tagging scheme.
- (5) Convert software to 32-bit.

8. Status of EBS. EBS proponents were invited, but unable to attend due to funding problems.

9. Status of CWSSC Recommendations.

a. Recommendation No. 1 - Make SPECSINTACT Fully SGML Compliant: EG&G has rectified many GS problems but some major ones remain, e.g., Document Type Definition (DTD) file. However, they expect full SGML compliance within a year or two. SGML documents could then be used with Corel WordPerfect and MS

Word Author. Tom Shaw will ask EG&G for a status report on the SGML implementation. Freddie Rush will prepare a memorandum to HQUSACE requesting EG&G give a status report of making SI fully SGML compliant. The memorandum will emphasize the importance of having SI fully SGML compliant, and the need for SGML documents for progress in RMS, EBS, and DrawSpec.

b. Recommendation No. 2 - Four hours of instruction on SPECSINTACT in PROSPECT Course on Specifications for Construction Contracts: Freddie was concerned that the proposed four hours would be insufficient to develop a working knowledge of SPECSINTACT. A suggestion was made that students are provided advance instructions to familiarize themselves with Construction Criteria Base and SPECSINTACT by locating information on the Internet. It was agreed to wait until completion of SI training by Ray Duncan to determine extent of future need for SI training. Recommendation No. 3 - Report on SI Training. Ray Duncan provided a schedule of the SPECSINTACT Transition Program Seminars including WordSpec template training (enclosure 3). He reported an average attendance of 12-14 students for Kansas City and Los Angeles. Anchorage had the largest attendance with 36 students. Ray noted a problem with students not knowing the requirements of writing specifications. He also has scheduled a seminar for MVD on 22-23 July in Vicksburg, MS.

c. Recommendation No. 4 - Civil Works Guide Specifications (CWGS) to be updated, developed or deleted:

i. CE 1308, Stone Protection. CEMVK is submitting updated CWGS 02542;

ii. CE 1309, Levees. MVD is coordinating an update of a GS on levees;

iii. Concrete Restoration. George Norton submitted a proposed GS on Dredging, Underwater Drilling and Blasting, Concrete Restoration and Earth Fills.

iv. Rock Anchors and Soil Anchors. Al Geisen submitted a proposed GS on Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls and Reinforced Steep Slopes.

v. CE 1102, Dredging. HQUSACE Construction-Operations advises there is no need for a Dredging GS. However, committee members are advised by Districts that need exists for such an update and AGC has stated inconsistencies between Districts. The committee agreed to query Engineering Divisions at Districts to determine need for guide specifications on New Construction Dredging and/or Maintenance Dredging. Engineering Divisions will coordinate responses with their Construction-Operations Division and Office of Counsel. Freddie will draft the memorandum to send Districts.

vi. Discussion followed on the fourteen CWGS noted in Enclosure 16 of March 1997 meeting minutes to be turned over to Hydroelectric Design Center (HDC). We agreed to relinquish the designated Guide Specifications (GS) to HDC for maintenance.

d. Recommendation No. 5 -HQUSACE appoint a POC and establish a process to update the CW Criteria on CCB CD-ROM: Charlie Baldi is the POC for CWGS and Joseph P. Hartman is POC for technical documents. Procedures to update the CW Criteria on CCB have been implemented by Charlie Baldi, HQUSACE IM and Jim Quinn.

e. Recommendation No. 6 - Mandate SPECSINTACT: The CEMP-EA memorandum, SUBJECT: SPECSINTACT, dated 14 APR 1997, recognized the mandate in the draft ER on Specifications Engineering which is to be released soon.

f. Recommendation No. 7 - Automating Amendments in SPECSINTACT: This recommendation was rejected at April 1997 SI-CCB meeting. There may be a

misunderstanding of the intent of the recommendation in the SI-CCB. We need to determine functions of PD2 regarding amendments, how much difficulty and cost between doing amendments by section and/or page. It may be that SI and PD2 can interface with each other and provide an automated method of generating amendments. However, the Committee is doubtful that the new PD2 will have automated capability to make changes to specifications. Amendments will still be entered into SI to keep the project specifications of record current. The committee directed Steve Freitas and George Norton clarify the recommendation and approach the SI-CCCB again. We'll also need to contact EG&G to determine the cost of implementation.

g. Recommendation No. 8 - Combine SPECSINTACT Table of Contents with Section Files: This recommendation has been adopted by SI-CCB and is being done by EG&G.

h. Recommendation No. 9 - Expand Charter of Civil Works Specifications Steering Committee to include Military Programs and HTRW: No official response has been received from Military Programs although there are positive indications that MP is agreeable to the recommendation. With Division restructuring, number of Division representatives on Committee may be reduced by two. Bill Wottlin and Joe Miller have agreed that Joe would be representative for Northwestern Division. Jim McHenry and Larry Seals should advise Committee at its next meeting if only one of them will represent Ohio River and Great Lakes Division. If Committee charter is expanded to include Military Programs, the membership could include Rick Dahnke and Jim Quinn.

i. Recommendation No. 10 - HQUSACE Reconsider Rescission of PARC Instruction Letter 92-4: PARC has advised that it has queried Districts and no problems exist in rescinding IL 92-4, therefore, no new instructions will be issued. George Norton and Don Carmen will investigate use of MasterFormat numbering to help establish contract format.

j. Recommendation No. 11 - Corps-wide Specifications Training Conference within the next year: Charlie Baldi is obtaining information on hotels in Las Vegas, but no developments are expected until funding is approved.

10. Technical Representatives for CWGS. Tom Shaw had requested the Committee to name technical proponents for 10 guide specifications. Resumes were reviewed and the following individuals were appointed technical proponents:

- a. CWGS 02211 Clearing (Timber and Structure): None Submitted
- b. CWGS 03230 Steel Stressing Tendons and Accessories for Prestressed Concrete, Mark Gonski, CEMVN-ED-TM.
- c. CWGS 05036 Metallizing: Hydraulic Structures, Thomas Andre, CELRP-ED-DT.
- d. CWGS 05911 Miter Gates, Michael Szwabnest, CELRH-ED-DS.
- e. CWGS 05912 Sector Gates, None Submitted.
- f. CWGS 05913 Tainter Gates and Anchorages, Phillip Sauser, CEMVP-PE-D.
- g. CWGS 15170 Electric Motors, 3-phase Vertical Induction Type, None Submitted.
- h. CWGS 15171 Electric Motors, 3-phase Vertical Synchronous Type, None Submitted.
- i. CWGS 16120 Insulated Wire and Cable, Lester Lowe, CELRN-EP-D.
- j. CWGS 16404 480-volt Station Service Switchgear and Transformers, Richard LaFerla, CENWO-ED-DD.

Freddie will check with Rock Island and New Orleans Districts for

CESPK-ED-M(1110)

SUBJECT: Civil Works Specifications Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

proponents on CWGS 05912, 15170 and 15171. We agreed that Tom, as Notice Program Manager, will have the responsibility for requesting technical proponents. Tom Shaw will notify the above proponents of their selection and participation in the program. Candidates not selected will be notified by their respective committee member and thanked for their interest. Tom will review all resumes submitted and hold them for future reference.

11. HQUSACE Policy Proponents. Some proposed changes to existing GS have been forwarded to HQ without further action or response. Reorganization and transfers of functions may be the reason things may have gotten behind or lost. The committee agreed to send a memo to HQUSACE requesting validation of HQUSACE policy proponents for CWGS.

12. MasterFormat.

a. The conversion of the CEGS, CWGS, and CEAGS to MasterFormat should be concurrent. The committee advised Tom Shaw to work with Jim Quinn to coordinate renumbering of CWGS and CEGS. Don Carmen and George Norton said they could assist.

b. Elimination of CWGS 01000. Tom Shaw moved to convert CWGS 01000 to an SPECSINTACT general note document (e.g., CWGSNOTE.DOC). Steven Freitas seconded the motion and the committee agreed unanimously.

13. Submittals. Ray Duncan stated the most common problem and complaint reported during the SPECSINTACT and WORDSPEC demonstration and training was on the Submittal Register. He handed out a sample problem statement and recommendation he received (enclosure 4). This could be submitted as a FORM 3078 action, but issue was tabled until formation of a joint committee to merge CEGS and CWGS.

14. Next Meeting. We will hold our next meeting after October 1997 in Arlington, TX, when funding is again available.

15. There being no further discussion or business for the Committee to consider, we adjourned the meeting.



Steven P. Freitas
Secretary, CWSSC

4 Encls

1. Attendance
2. Agenda
3. Seminars
4. Submittal Register Problem

CIVIL WORKS SPECIFICATIONS STEERING COMMITTEE
Meeting Attendance
Arlington, Texas.
17 June 1997

1.	Thomas R. Shaw	CEMVK-ED-DE	(601) 631-5579
2.	Freddie S. Rush	CEMVD-ET-ET	(601) 634-5936
3.	Jim McHenry	CELRD-GL-E-EQ-T	(312) 353-1801
4.	Al Geisen	CEMVP-PE-D	(612) 290-5522
5.	George H. Norton	CENAE-EP-DG	(617) 647-8870
6.	Joe Miller	CENWD-MRR	(402) 697-2649
7.	John Kerkowski	CENAD-ET-ET	(212) 264-7106
8.	Bill Wottlin	CENPD-ET-E	(503) 326-3861
9.	Bill Miller	CELRD-OR-ET-EQ	(513) 684-2267
10.	Tim Pope	CESAD-ET-EG	(404) 331-6703
11.	Don Carmen	CESAW-EP-EE	(910) 251-4656
12.	Donald L. Bergner	CESPD-ET-ET	(415) 977-8101
13.	Steven P. Freitas	CESPK-ED-M	(916) 557-7296
14.	David W. Barber	CESWD-ETE-T	(214) 767-2385
15.	Ray Duncan	Spec Consultants	(601) 638-8958

AGENDA

CIVIL WORKS SPECIFICATIONS STEERING COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, 17 JUNE 1997

0800 - 0810	Announcements	Freddie Rush
0810 - 0820	Review and Discuss Agenda	Committee
0820 - 0830	HQUSACE Comments	Charlie Baldi
0830 - 0845	Review and Approve Minutes of Fourth Meeting	Committee
0845 - 0900	Status of ER 1110-2-1250	Charlie Baldi
0900 - 0920	Report on SI-CCB Meeting	Tom Shaw
0920 - 0945	Report on SI Training	Charlie Baldi
0945 - 1005	Break	
1005 - 1045	Expanding Committee Charter	Charlie Baldi
1045 - 1100	Levee & Stone Protection	Freddie Rush
1100 - 1130	Status-Other Recommendations	Freddie Rush
1130 - 1230	Lunch	
1230 - 1315	Tech Proponents for CWGS	Committee
1315 - 1345	Master Format	Ray Duncan
1345 - 1415	Submittals	Ray Duncan
1415 - 1435	Break	
1435 - 1500	Committee Funding	Committee
1500 - 1600	Open Discussion/New Issues	Committee
1600 - 1615	Details of Next Meeting	Committee
1615 - 1630	Wrapup	Committee

SPECSINTACT Transition Program Seminars

21-25 April 97 – Kansas City, MO

27-30 May 97 – Los Angeles, CA

2-6 June 97 – Anchorage, AL

7-11 July 97 – Honolulu, HI

14-18 July 97 – Portland OR

28-31 July 97 – Atlanta, GA

A. Ray Duncan, Jr.
P. O. Box 1293
Vicksburg, MS 39181
Phone 601-638-8958
e-mail duncan@vicksburg.com

ENCLOSURE 3

Army Submittal Register Problem.

There is a serious problem with the way submittals are handled in Army guide specifications. During the SPECSINTACT Transition Program Support effort in Baltimore District, the problem was brought out by Mr. Robert M. King CENAB-CO-SQ (410-962-6695) who works in Construction Division.

Statement of Problem. The problem with the Army handling of submittals is that it does not give Construction Division the information that they need to administer the contract. Construction Division needs to have identified each item for which a submittal is required and what must be submitted for that item. SPECSINTACT is capable of providing such information if the guide specifications are prepared in the manner such that the information is produced on the submittal register. The problem is that the Army Guide specifications are not in many cases coded in a manner to provide that information. (Civil Works Guide Specifications are coded following the Navy method and do not suffer from this problem.)

CEGS Method. In many of the CEGS specifications the individual submittals required are not identified. In other words, the submittal requirements for the CEGS section 16415 "ELECTRICAL WORK INTERIOR" simply say submit product information on Electrical Work without identifying the exact items requiring a submission. For example, "receptacles" are not identified as a submittal item but the contractor could be expected to submit on them under the general requirements for submittals in the this section. Construction Division wants to have "receptacles" identified specifically as a submittal so they can track it and so they can know what information is to be submitted on the "receptacles". The method employed in the Military Guide Specifications also results in SPECSINTACT producing a submittal register which is almost useless. (see the Army Submittal Register for Section 16415) Under the heading which lists the paragraph where the submittal requirement is to be found, normally only the submittal paragraph itself is identified (usually 1.3 or 1.4). In the case of Section 16415 only paragraph 1.3 is identified in the submittal register. There are no paragraphs tagged in Part 2 or Part 3 of the specification and therefore there are no paragraph numbers in the submittal register identifying the paragraph in Part 2 or Part 3 of the section. The requirements for evaluating the submittal would be specified in Part 2 or Part 3 of the specification for most cases. If the paragraph detailing the requirements for the submittal were identified in the submittal register, Construction would know exactly where to look for the

ENCLOSURE 4

requirements of that submittal. (see pages from CEGS 16415 showing tagging)

NAVY Method. The Navy has used a method which results in a much more useable submittal register (see Navy submittal register for Section 16402 "INTERIOR DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM). The method is very simple.

1. Try to always identify the product requirements and submittal information required for a product in Part 2 or Part 3 of the section.
2. If there is no text which lends itself to identification in Part 2 or Part 3 of the section, add a subparagraph in Part 1 of the section identifying the product and the information to be submitted.

Action Being Taken. Mr. King was informed of the differences in the Military Guide Specifications and the Navy Guide specifications. A submittal register on Navy section 16402 which is similar to the Army section 16415 was also provide to Mr. King. The Navy submittal register had a multitude of submittals identified and the submittal register identified the paragraph in Part 2 or Part 3 of the section where the submittal requirements were detailed. The Army submittal register showed only paragraph 1.3 for these multitude of submittals and did not identify the individual products which were to be submitted. (see Army Submittal Register sheets) Mr. King was going to try to start an action through Construction Channels to bring the issue to a head.

Recommendation. The method being used in the Military Guide Specifications makes the Submittal Register almost useless and is not in conformance with the intent of the regulations on submittals. The method used by the Navy and followed by Civil Works Guide specifications provides a much more useable submittal register. Additionally, if the Navy method were followed rigorously, a SPECSINTACT software enhancement could be added which would automatically delete submittals from Part 1 of the section if they were deleted in Part 2 or Part 3. This enhancement is impossible with the method being employed in CEGS specifications.